



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,334	02/06/2004	Masayuki Ezawa	1248-0698P	4508
2292	7590	08/14/2007		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 747			PHILIPPE, GIMS S	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/14/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailto:mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/772,334	EZAWA, MASAYUKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gims S. Philippe	2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,7,9-13 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 3-6,8,14 and 15 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/24/04, 2/6/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first office action in response to application no. 10/772,334 filed on February 6th 2004 in which claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Drawings

1. Figure 19-20 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to

Art Unit: 2621

support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 16 defines a processing program embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claim does not define a computer-readable medium or memory and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized" – Guidelines Annex IV). That is, the scope of the presently claimed processing program can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" or equivalent in order to make the claim statutory. Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

Art Unit: 2621

It is suggested that the applicant amends the claim to read "a computer readable medium encoded with a computer program ...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-2, 7, 9-13, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujii et al. (US Patent no. 6392690) in view of Van Berkel (US Patent Application Publication no. 2003/0011884 A1).

As per claims 1-2, 7, Fujii discloses an image processing apparatus, comprising a reduction calculation means for reducing the number of a plurality of input image data, corresponding to a plurality of images that satisfy azimuth difference relations each other, in a lateral direction, respectively (See Fujii fig. 14, 16, and 17 col. 12, lines 36-44); three-dimensional processing means for combining the image data that have been reduced the number by the reduction calculation means so as to prepare a three-dimensional image data (See Fujii col. 12, lines 66-67, col. 13, lines 1-9).

It is noted that Fujii is silent about a switching means for switching and selecting which one of three-dimensional image data prepared by the three-dimensional

processing means and two-dimensional image data prepared by using one of the plurality of input image data should be outputted.

However, Van Berkel discloses an image processing means including a switching means for switching and selecting which one of three-dimensional image data prepared by the three-dimensional processing means and two-dimensional image data prepared by using one of the plurality of input image data should be outputted (See Van Berkel [0020, lines 9-13] and [0055]).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Fujii's image processing means by incorporating Van Berkel's switching means for switching and selecting which one of three-dimensional image data prepared by the three-dimensional processing means and two-dimensional image data prepared by using one of the plurality of input image data should be outputted. The motivation for performing such a modification in Fujii is to alleviate the known problem with small print presented on 3-D display by providing a display convertible between a 2-D mode and a 3-D mode as taught by Van Berkel (See Van Berkel [0008]).

As per claim 9-10, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Fujii further provides pickup means for picking up the plurality of images to satisfy azimuth difference relations each other so as to obtain the plurality of input image data (See Fujii col. 10, lines 53-59).

As per claim 11-12, Fujii further discloses the display means as being of parallax barrier type (See figs. 3 and 5 and col. 9, lines 40-48), and of lenticular lens type (See fig. 9).

As per claim 13, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 16-18, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Fujii further discloses using a computer to perform the processing (See Fujii col. 10, lines 43-52).

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Woodgate et al. (US Patent Application Publication no. 2004/0240777 A1) teaches optical switching apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S. Philippe whose telephone number is (571) 272-7336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dastouri Mehrdad can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2621

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Gims S Philippe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

GSP

August 8, 2007